REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The claim amendments here are supported in the Specification as filed, at, for example, paragraphs [0013] – [0018] and Figs. 2-3. Accordingly, no new matter has been added. With claims 5, 23, and 31 being canceled, the claims pending upon entry of this amendment are 1-4, 6, 10-15, 19-22, 24, and 29.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103

According to the Office Action, the independent claims 1, 10, and 19 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,263,348 issued to Kathrow, et al. ("Kathrow") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,230 issued to Pereira ("Pereira"). The rejection also refers to some aspects of the Microsoft NT operating system, as explained below.

In particular, the Office Action argues that the Microsoft NT operating system teaches Applicants' claimed operation in claim 1 of *generating ... a user identity value associated with a user identity* ... except that it does not teach the fact that the claim requires that the user identity value be generated by *an application program running in a computer* and that the *identity value is associated with user identity that is authorized to change a system registry of the computer.* Applicants respectfully submit therefore that the rejection is improper at the start, because it relies on a process for authenticating a user, **to give the user access to a server.** Although the user enters a password, and a client program hashes the password, this password must then be sent as a response to the server. It is then the server that compares the hashed password to stored values to find a match, and, if there is a match, then the user is allowed to access the server.

Next, the Office Action looks to another reference, Kathrow, for teaching the *generation of a registry security value associated with a system registry.* This is in the context of the process in Kathrow which determines whether a file, such as a Windows system registry, has been modified. Kathrow describes a process to determine whether two files are different, by comparing hashed functions or fingerprints of them (instead of their contents explicitly). If they are different, then processing is halted.

Thus, the Microsoft NT operating system teachings and the teachings of Kathrow are separate requirements, one for authenticating a user and the other for determining whether a file has been modified.

Next, the Office Action looks to Pereira which discloses an access control program that users an API to modify a system registry. In Pereira, the process is designed to control and limit access, by different users, to various resources in a computer. The access control program verifies whether a particular user is authorized for a particular, requested resource. There is a list of authorized resources for each user. This list is used to modify the system registry upon initialization, to identify only those programs which are authorized to be displayed to a particular user. [Pereira, col. 10, lines 29-33] Another program component monitors operating system file access calls, and verifies whether a given user is authorized to access a particular file.

The teachings of the relied upon prior art can be again summarized as follows:

The Microsoft NT operating system has a process for authenticating a user to give the user access to a server; Kathrow describes a process to determine whether two files are different; and Pereira describes how to control and limit access by different users to various resources in a computer.

In contrast, Applicants' claim 1 has been amended to more clearly identify the invention relative to the prior art, by reciting *a method to detect tampering with registry settings in a computer by an application program running in the computer. Each time a system registry setting is changed within the application by an authorized user, the registry security value is updated. When reading from the system registry, a new registry security value is generated and compared to the stored value to determine if processing should be allowed to continue. When monitoring the system registry for attempts to change it, the user is prompted for identify information and a new user identity value is generated which is compared to the stored value. In addition, a new registry security value is generated and compared with the stored value. Only if both of these new values match the stored values is the user allowed to make changes to the system registry.* As the relied upon art references do not teach or suggest such a method for detecting tampering with registry systems, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is not obvious.

Independent claims 10 and 19 have been amended with limitations that are similar to those discussed above in support of the patentability of claim 1. Accordingly, those independent claims are submitted as not being obvious for at least the same reasons given above in support of claim 1.

Any dependent claims not mentioned above are submitted as being neither anticipated or obvious, for at least the same reasons given above in support of their respective base claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 26, 2006.

By _____
Farzad E. Amini, Reg. No. 42,261

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted online via EFS Web to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on October 26, 2006.

_____
Margaux Rodriguez *October 26, 2006*